

Perhaps at no time in our history have we needed an increase in international exchange programs. We find ourselves in a world that in many ways is more complex than when it was dominated by two ideologies. International exchange programs are necessary to give our students an appreciation of our country and its place in the world.

The Fulbright program has been administered by an even older institution, the Institute for International Education [IIE]. Last year I had the honor to address the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary Forum of the IIE. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks from this event be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OPENING REMARKS

(By Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan)

Andrew Heiskell began by noting the setting we're in, the New York Public Library. I was brought up in this library in a very important way. I was brought up into an understanding of what the United States could provide for people.

In the 1930s, in the midst of the Depression, I shined shoes, pretty much for a living. But it was a living that was fair enough. I would work between Sixth and Seventh Avenues at the Wurlitzer Building, in a little territorial space of my own. When I had earned \$1.10, which was five cents up in the subway, five cents back, and a dollar for the day, I'd come over here as a shoe shine boy, with a black box. I'd take it in the Fifth Avenue entrance and bring it to the check-in desk. It would be accepted, without comment, as if it were an umbrella being presented in the lobby of a Pall Mall club. I'd be given a ticket by a man in a brown cotton jacket. I'd go up in that great room. I was a citizen of the world and of literature. And indeed, for those purposes. I was, I can never repay that debt.

I'm here to talk about the Fulbright experience and the Institute of International Education. IIE sent me off 44 years ago, in 1950, to the London School of Economics. There, for the first time, I learned a dictum of Seymour Martin Lipset, who said, "He who knows only one country knows no country."

If you use the simple analogy of eyesight, it is two eyes that provide perspective. And it was a perspective enormously striking to me at that time—1950, the United States in good condition, untouched by war, and, indeed, enlivened by it. The recovery was extraordinary, and Europe was just climbing out of the ruins. We were victorious allies. I found, though, on arriving at the London School of Economics as a person of liberal disposition, a New Deal democrat, if you like, how extraordinarily suspicious of the United States were most folks there, the academics in particular, and the Left, to be specific.

And then came the Korean War. I was called back. We mustered in Grosvenor Square, got on a train at Waterloo, and in the late afternoon we were crossing the Netherlands on our way, as it would turn out, to Bremerhaven, which was a submarine base the Nazis had built.

I had brought along a library habit that had been imbued here, made possible largely through the GI bill and its book allowance. I brought an enormous volume of Hannah Arendt's, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, just then published in Great Britain. This

was her masterwork. I brought it along, not to read, really, but to be seen reading. So, I got in this compartment, as they then had in European railways—there were six of us—and I opened it up. Here was the first paragraph. "Two world wars in one generation, separated by an uninterrupted chain of local wars and revolutions, followed by no peace treaty for the vanquished and no respite for the victor, have ended in the anticipation of a third World War between the two remaining world powers. This moment of anticipation is like the calm that settles after all hopes have died."

I read that. Then I read it out loud to the compartment. No one demurred. Finally, a commander, who had a Navy Cross and was the senior officer present afloat said, "There must be a bar car on this train somewhere." And that was that.

I began to sense then the power of Marxism as an idea, the inevitability of the clash of civilizations—the totalitarian, the liberal—you could read it either way, and some did. And some looked both ways simultaneously. The first thing I ever published was a letter from London in *The Nation*, in response to an article by G.D.H. Cole, who suggested that the Korean War was an act of American aggression, intended to invade China and the Soviet Union. I said, "No, no, no, surely that's not so." I got a surprising amount of mail from the British, Londoners, who said that's obviously right, but that's what they all think.

But having had this experience of the power of Marxism, it became possible for me years later, in different circumstances, to see its decline. Having seen it at the flood tide of its strength, you saw it recede. You couldn't have done that absent the international experience. And it was startling to be in Washington, and see how little this was understood.

In 1979, *Newsweek* had an issue on "what will happen in the 1980s," and I wrote a small piece that said, "Well, in the 1980s, the Soviet Union will break up. That's obvious." And will the world blow up as its constituent parts start using their nuclear weapons one on the other? This issue is not yet resolved. I'm not aware if anyone read the article, but I was then on the Intelligence Committee, and I would make this argument, an argument impenetrable to the intelligence community. They didn't know what you were talking about.

I was once, for a long period, an observer to the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, the START talks. I remember asking the negotiators, when we were finished with the mind-numbing details of this treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, what makes you think there will be a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

Well, to them this question was not a question. They had never heard it before and went right by it. When the treaty did arrive at the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I am a member, it was between the United States of America and four countries, of which I think I'd only heard of two. They were Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan.

I had the doubtful pleasure of asking the ambassadors who were presenting this to us. "It says here it's a treaty between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., and then yet it says, no, no, it's these four other countries. How do you know it's with these other four countries?"

They said, "We have letters." I said, "Well where did you get them?" They said, "We got them in Lisbon." It sounded like a World War II Humphrey Bogart movie. Oh. Got them in Lisbon. I see.

In fact, had we had a better feel for what you could have learned in those years, we

might not be in such straitened circumstances as we are today. That failure of understanding of international politics came about because of an insularity about the essential fact, the opposition of ideas, and then a pre-occupation with the minute, mechanical fallout of those ideas.

This clash of ideas is not over. It now assumes yet another phase. At the beginning of this century, there were two commanding, universal ideas. You could call them liberal, if you like, and Marxist, if you choose. The liberal idea, in the general usage in nineteenth-century England, was that the group identity that was called nationalist, or ethnic, was preindustrial and would simply disappear as it became more and more outdated and irrelevant. The other side, the Marxist view, was that economic processes determine all identity, that the class structure determines all social struggle, and that it would be universal in its nature. The red flag is red because the blood of all men and women is red. And that is the universality of the class struggle.

Well, both ideas were wrong. Deeply wrong. And we enter into an age subsequent to that, in which not the only, but the most painful, the most immediate source of conflicts is ethnic. It is ethnic conflict as a post-industrial phenomenon—ethnic conflict as a mode of aggregating interests that is far more effective than any other mode seen on earth just now.

If you look around the world, that is what you mostly encounter. We are two or three generations behind any understanding of it. Just as the American political establishment had no real understanding of Marxism in 1950, it has no real understanding of ethnicity today. We're as unprepared for Bosnia as we were for Leningrad.

And there's one answer to it, if there's any answer. That is to go abroad and study it, and see it, taste it, touch it, feel it. And there's one institution singularly devoted to just that purpose. And that is the Institute of International Education.

You were welcoming to me, a gawky and half-formed youth, nearly half a century ago. There will be others like me coming, possibly to your embarrassment. But with any luck, it all works out, and I'm here to thank you and wish you another three-quarters of a century as successful as the last.

#### TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF FARM AID

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this Sunday will mark the 10th anniversary of Farm Aid. This remarkable organization, born of the farm crisis of the 1980's, has stood on the front lines with America's family farmers as farming, ranching and the rural way of life have been under attack. Through the vision and effort of founders Willie Nelson, Neil Young, and John Mellencamp, millions of dollars have been raised to assist farm families beset by disaster, fund legal assistance programs for rural citizens and increase national and international awareness of the plight of America's family farmer.

At the same time we are celebrating the achievements of Farm Aid, the Republican-controlled Congress is making the deepest cuts to farm programs in history—at the same time they are funding tax breaks for the wealthiest citizens in the country. Make no mistake, a workable farm program cannot be crafted under a mandate to cut \$13.4

billion from farm programs. This legislation could result in a farm crisis far worse than the one that gave birth to Farm Aid.

The 1995 farm bill is far too important to be sacrificed this way. That's why several of my colleagues have joined me in introducing the Farm Security Act, an alternative way to reform farm programs and secure a safety net for our farmers. We have developed a commodity support proposal that would allow market-based income support, target benefits to our smaller producers, and simplify programs. Unlike the Republican plan, our plan offers real reform. We didn't just cut funding levels by providing less of the same old programs that are already too complicated, too rigid and too inequitable.

The goal of farm programs should be to give America's farmers and rural communities a fair shake. Farmers do not want a handout. They do not want welfare. They want a program that reflects the principles that launched Farm Aid 10 years ago: a helping hand that lets them grow the best food and fiber in the world with minimal bureaucracy and with a good return on their financial and labor investments. Today, however, farm programs have become, in the minds of some people who have never milked a cow or plowed a field, a sacrificial lamb that can be offered up to fund new defense programs and unreasonable tax breaks.

For many farm families across the country, the organizations supported by Farm Aid have been all that stood between them and disaster. The counseling, educational and legal services these groups provide have helped farm families navigate some very difficult times. In my State of South Dakota, Dakota Rural Action, a Farm Aid-supported group, has been an effective voice for family farmers and rural communities. Through grassroots organization, educational programming on issues from land stewardship to meatpacker concentration, and effective policy advocacy, they have brought the voices of farmers to the halls of Congress.

I am deeply concerned about how rural communities across the Nation continue to whither as more and more farmers are driven off their land and young people find it increasingly difficult to begin farming. Now that the majority in Congress has threatened to pull the rug out from under our farmers again, Farm Aid and the groups it supports will be needed more than ever to provide support and leadership for our rural communities.

The strengths of rural America have always been hard work, fair play and commitment to community. I applaud the efforts of Farm Aid to facilitate these goals and secure a bright future for America's farmers and ranchers. There is a reason why the Midwest is called America's Heartland. It is because our farmers, ranchers and rural citizens truly represent the heart and

soul of America. If we continue to take for granted the men and women who live on the land and produce our food, we will lose an important piece of our national soul.

#### NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, 30 years ago today on September 29, 1995, I was proud to witness President Lyndon Johnson sign into law the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act which established the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. That historic occasion marked the beginning of a process to preserve America's cultural heritage and to broaden access to millions of our citizens in every corner of the country, Americans who would otherwise not be able to hear a symphony orchestra concert, see a dance or theater production, or experience a great museum exhibition.

By any measure, the endowments have been a magnificent success. People are participating in our culture in record numbers. The endowments have made a difference in the lives of millions of children and their families. A cultural infrastructure has solidified and grown. In 1965, where there were 46 nonprofit theaters, there are over 425 today. The numbers of large orchestras has doubled, opera companies have increased 6-fold, and there are 10 times as many dance companies now as there were 30 years ago. In 1965, there were five State arts agencies; today every State has a vibrant public arts agency, and there are now community arts agencies in over 3,800 cities, counties and towns. Individuals who have received endowment support early in their careers have gone on to spectacular achievement, earning numerous important prizes and awards, and creating works that will prove to be an enduring legacy from the second half of the 20th century.

In my own State of Rhode Island, the endowments have supported a Music in our Schools program in Providence, a folk and traditional arts apprenticeship program and the nationally-acclaimed Trinity Repertory Theater; aided the Museum of Art at the Rhode Island School of Design in renovating its painting and sculpture facilities; and provided funds to a team of scholars at the Rhode Island Historical Society to edit the papers of Revolutionary War Gen. Nathaniel Greene for publication. Also funded was a partnership between the Rhode Island State Council on the Arts and the U.S. Department of Education to integrate theater, music and design into the curriculum of the Davies Career and Technical High School which has shown to improve overall discipline and attendance at the school.

As further testimony to their success, the small investments in American culture made by the endowments

has stimulated an extraordinary amount of private dollars. Since 1985, NEH matching funds have leveraged almost \$1.4 billion in third-party support for the humanities. Each Federal dollar invested by NEA leverages \$12 non-Federal dollars.

As we celebrate the 30th anniversary of the endowments, we are celebrating our belief in a vigorous, democratic, far-reaching culture. The Federal Government has a strong role to play in transmitting our Nation's greatest artistic and scholarly achievements to the generations of the future. As the present custodians of American culture, we must continue to do so. It would be a tragedy for the 30th anniversary celebration to be marred by a reluctance to reauthorize the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

#### UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR THE PEACE PROCESS IN LIBERIA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent cease-fire agreement in Liberia. After nearly 6 years of civil war, 13 failed peace agreements and protracted negotiations, the leaders of Liberia's warring factions have finally coalesced to form a government aimed at bringing peace and democracy to this war-torn African nation. This recent peace agreement, agreed to on August 19, 1995, in Abuja Nigeria, provides the United States with a unique opportunity to demonstrate leadership in restoring peace and democracy to a longtime ally, as well as to prove its concern for the stability of the entire West African region.

Mr. President, I would like to begin my statement by identifying several key actors who deserve recognition for procuring this peace agreement: Members of ECOWAS, the Economic Community of West African States, ECOMOG, the West African peace-keeping force, UNOMIL, the U.N. observer mission, and the President's Special Envoy to Liberia, Ambassador Dane Smith, I would particularly commend the extraordinary diplomatic leadership shown by President Jerry Rawlings of Ghana and his Deputy Foreign Minister Muhamed Ibn Chambas. I know and greatly admire both men; their commitment to peace in Liberia is exemplary and is one of the key reasons why this cease-fire and agreement have been archived.

On a local level, I would like to pay special tribute to my esteemed colleague on the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Kansas. As Chair of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, she is a strong leader, an able manager, a model for bipartisanship, and a tremendous resource on issues regarding African affairs. Last week, Senator KASSEBAUM introduced amendment 2710, stating that it is in the interest of the United States to "strongly support the peace process